

COPING WITH PCC/CONSER AUTHENTICATED COPY  
FOR THE SAME TITLE  
TREATED BOTH AS A SERIAL AND AS A  
MONOGRAPH

Now and again, new evidence appears about a specific title that forces us to reconsider the first decision to catalog as a monograph or a serial. For example, another volume appears that is marked v. 2 or has a prominent frequency statement. The monograph-to-serial type is surely the most common, but there are also cases where monographic treatment now seems preferable to serial treatment, for example when it becomes clear that a date in a title falsely caused us to assume seriality for a one-shot title, or when conferences have analyzable titles.

The problem: Do we need a mechanism to mark such records in the national files?

The Library of Congress example:

- 1) In some cases the monograph records for the title will be deleted, that is, removed from the LC ILS and the CDS MDS-Books file. Although LC removes these records from the MDS-Books file and its own ILS, they are not removed from the OCLC database. These deleted MARC monographic records can be readily identified in OCLC by encoding level "J." Not deleting the OCLC record affords OCLC customers the option to continue using monographic treatment, if they so choose.
- 2) When LC decides that an authenticated record is not a serial, it inputs the code "xlc" in the 042 of the serial record, removing all other codes (see exception below\*). This removes the record from further distribution by OCLC and CDS. The record is then deleted from both the LC ILS and the CONSER file. The record remains in OCLC but can be easily identified by the xlc in the 042 field. This also affords OCLC customers the option to continue using serial treatment if they so desire.

\*Exception: If code nsdp is present in field 042, it is retained as the first code, the xlc is added as the second code, and the record remains in the CONSER database.

The CONSER example:

- 1) Whenever a CONSER library authenticates serial copy for which there are authenticated DLC monographs, the CONSER library in question contacts LC to notify them of the LCCN of the monographs affected. If LC agrees to also treat the title as a serial, the affected monographic records are deleted from the LC ILS and MDS-Books, and the newly-authenticated CONSER record is used by LC.
- 2) Whenever a CONSER library believes that serial copy, in retrospect, should not have been authenticated for a title, it contacts LC. If LC agrees, the serial record is deleted from the CONSER database and the OCLC record is de-authenticated and reported to OCLC for deletion.

Questions:

- 1) Do CONSER and BIBCO members see a need for marking a record when different treatment (serial or monograph) is deemed more appropriate?

- 2) What mechanisms could be put in place to mark duplicate monograph pcc records? One possibility: introduce an 042 code "xpcc" to parallel what happens in serials. This option would preserve the actual encoding level of the record (unlike the J option above), indicating that the record met PCC standards in other respects, but is now no longer a part of the regular BIBCO file of records. In addition, the code would be documented in MARC21 as something that is legitimately used to mark records and thus could be used by RLIN PCC libraries as well.
- 3) Who would have the responsibility for reporting duplicate monographic records and ensuring that they are appropriately marked?
- 4) Should the responsibility for handling these requests rotate among members of CONSER OpCo? Other options for reporting and editing records?
- 5) Similarly, if such a reporting mechanism is seen to be needed for reporting monographs, is there also a need for BIBCO participants to identify CONSER serial copy that needs to be de-authenticated. What are some ideas for putting this into place?